



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,683	02/16/2001	Kenneth J. Thorpe	11896 B	4543

7590 05/26/2004

CHARLES E. BAXLEY, ESQUIRE
Hart, Baxley, Daniels & Holton
59 John Street, Fifth Floor
New York, NY 10038

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,683

Applicant(s)

THORPE, KENNETH J.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed on 2/16/01.
2. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 18, 19, 21 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities: the “;” for separating the elements in the group is not proper. It should be a comma. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claims 10 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: the language as “*chosen from the group comprising: a financial institution system ...*” (claim 10, line 2) or “*chosen from the group comprising: a bankruptcy database service, ...*” (claim 26, line 2) is not proper. As stated in MPEP 2173.05 (h):

Alternative expressions are permitted if they present no uncertainty or ambiguity with respect to the question of scope or clarity of the claims. One acceptable form of alternative expression, which is commonly referred to as a Markush group, recites members as being “selected from the group consisting of A, B and C.” See Ex parte Markush, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). Ex parte Markush sanctions claiming a genus expressed as a group consisting of certain specified materials. Inventions in metallurgy, refractories, ceramics, pharmacy, pharmacology and biology are most frequently claimed under the Markush formula but purely mechanical features or process steps may also be claimed by using the Markush style of claiming. See Ex parte Head, 214 USPQ 551 (Bd. App. 1981); In re Gaubert, 524 F.2d 1222, 187 USPQ 664 (CCPA 1975); and In re Harnisch, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980). It is improper to use the term “comprising” instead of “consisting of.” Ex parte Dotter, 12 USPQ 382 (Bd. App. 1931).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10-13, 15, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rothman et al. (US 2002/0072984 A1, 6/13/02, filed 12/13/00, priority 6/1/00).

Regarding independent claim 1, Rothman discloses:

- a hub system (figure 1: the seller *central* server)
- a drafting entity system for preparing a legal document and communicating the legal document to the hub system (figure 1, [0007]: at the remote terminal, a user makes a purchase order, which means prepares a purchase order, and *send it to the seller central server* ; a purchase order is a legal document since it is a contract between the buyer and the seller; the terminal system has the preparing feature, thus is considered equivalent to the drafting entity system as claimed)
- setting a geographic area within which an actor entity will receive the legal document ([0007], [0008]: the geographic area where there are retailers having available product for the purchase order is identified by the seller central server inherently shows that a geography area within which a retailer receiving the order

is set; [0102]: transmitting the product order to one of the retailers in a geographic area indicates that the retailer is the one who receives the product order in said geographic area)

- determining the existence of the actor entity within the geographic area ([0007], [0008]: identifying the retailers in the geographic area having available product for the order shows determining the existence of the retailers in said geographic area)
- a geographic area system including an area selector within which and an actor entity determinator (since the system Rothman has the capabilities of setting a geographic area within which an actor entity will receive the legal document and determining the existence of the actor entity within the geographic area, Rothman inherently includes a subsystem equivalent to the geographic area subsystem as claimed)
- receiving the legal document from the hub system ([0102]: transmitting the product order to one of the retailers *from the seller central server* shows receiving the product order from the hub system)
- an actor entity system, located within the geographic area, that receives the legal document from the hub system (the retailer system *receiving the purchase order* from the seller central server shows that the retailer system is an actor entity system)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses setting the geographic area based on a distance from a location (figure 13: the distance - by miles - from a location - by zipcode; the geographic data with distance from a zipcode provided by user used for setting the geography area of a retailer, which is an actor entity).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses that the geographic area subsystem is part of the hub system ([0007]: the fact that the seller server *can identify one or more retailers in the geographic location* having an available product inherently shows that the seller central server has the capability of setting a geographic area within which an actor receiving a purchase order since identifying retailers is based on the defined geographic information. That means, the seller central server includes a subsystem for performing the setting the geographic location function. In other words, said subsystem is part of the seller central server, which is a hub system).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses that the actor entity system is chosen from the group comprising: a financial institution system and a law enforcement agency system ([0039]: the fact that the network server may communicate with a *third party payment processing server* for processing an online purchase order indicates that the payment processing server, which is a financial institution, is an actor entity who receives the purchase order for processing financially).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses the hub system includes an input/output for communicating data to and from the actor entity system, and to and from the drafting entity system ([0055], [0056]: input/output devices for communicating from the seller central server to the user terminal where a purchase is prepared, and for communicating from the seller central server to the local distributor, which is a retailer, where the retailer is equivalent to an actor entity).

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses that the hub system includes a verification subsystem that checks data for completeness (figure 11, #1110-1116: at the seller website, checking if the location data such as zip code, area code, or the like of the user is determined through the IP trace, if not, search internet service provider database for user IP information; since the location data is the data provided by the user, checking if location data is okay is considered as checking the completeness of the data).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses the hub system includes an actor entity rule subsystem that checks the legal document based on rules of the actor entity system to receive the legal document ([0007], [0009], [0010]: the seller server identifies one or more retailers in the geographic location having an available product, where in said geographic location, the retailer receiving the order is responsible for a product sale; [0042]-[0043]: local retailers may register with the website in order to sell the product offered by the seller at one or more geographic

locations; the fact that the seller server identifies a retailer, who will receive the order, in a geographic location, based on the retailer registration's information shows that the seller server in Rothman checks on the registration's information of a retailer, which is considered as rules, for the seller server to transmit the purchase order to the retailer, if there is no retailer's registration, the retailer in the geographic area can not receive the purchase order).

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman discloses that the hub system includes a search engine subsystem for accessing a service system outside the hub system ([0089], [0090], figures 14 and 15: the fact that Rothman displays the search results when the user accesses the web site of the seller server shows that the seller server, which is the hub system, includes the search engine system for performing the search function).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not explicitly disclose that the hub system includes a legal document type determinator ([0039]: the fact that when making the product order, the user specifies an *online* purchase or an *offline* purchase of the product shows that *there are two types of product orders determined in the seller server* that the user can specify one; in other words, the seller server includes a legal type determinator).

Regarding independent claim 18, Rothman discloses:

- preparing a legal document on a first entity system (figure 1, [0007]: at the remote terminal, a user makes a purchase order, equivalent to preparing a purchase order, which is a legal document)
- setting a geographic area within which the legal document will be communicated ([0007], [0008], [0102]: identifying a geographic area where there are retailers having available product for the product order shows that a geographic area within which the product order will be transmitted to a retailer is set)
- communicating the legal document to a hub system ([0007]: the product order is sent to the seller *central* server)
- communicating the legal document from the hub system to a second entity within the geographic area ([0007], [0008], [0102]: transmitting the product order from the seller central order to the retailer in an identified geographic area)

Independent claim 19 is for a program product of method claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 4, 9, 20-23, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothman et al. (US 2002/0072984 A1, 6/13/02, filed 12/13/00, priority 6/1/00).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not explicitly disclose selecting a type of actor entity that will receive the legal document.

However, Rothman does teach that the seller server will transmit the product order to the retailer for *processing the order and providing the product to a customer* ([0007], [0102]). Rothman further discloses that the seller server may communicate with a third party payment processing server such as a credit card or a bank to *accomplish the payment* [0039].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rothman to incorporate selecting a type of actor entity that will receive the legal document since the fact that Rothman sends the order to either a retailer or a bank suggests that Rothman have a selection of a type of a receiver of a product order before sending it out for different purposes.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Rothman discloses that wherein the location is an address (figure 13: the zip code is part of an address; [0037]: the fact that personal identification information including the *geographic location* such as zip code provided by users to the seller center suggests that the personal information may include the address containing zip code of the user).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not explicitly disclose that the geographic area subsystem is part of the drafting entity system.

However, Rothman does disclose that when making a purchase order, the user also selects the retailer in her/his area by selecting a geographic area (figure 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rothman to incorporate the geographic area subsystem as part of the drafting entity system since selecting a geographic area as a part of making a purchase order suggests that the drafting entity system at the user terminal include the geographic area subsystem.

Claim 20 is a program product of system claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 21, Rothman discloses a system for:

- preparing a legal document for use (figure 1, [0007]: at the remote terminal, a user *makes a purchase order*; it is noted that a purchase order is a legal document since it is a contract between the buyer and the seller, and making a purchase order is considered as preparing said order; figure 9: the seller central server, which is equivalent to a hub system, provides the incomplete purchase order to a user terminal to prepare a purchase order when a user accesses the seller website)

Art Unit: 2178

- setting a geographic area within which an actor entity will receive the legal document ([0007], [0008]: the geographic area where there are retailers having available product for the order is identified by the seller server inherently shows that a geography area within which a retailer, which is an actor entity, receiving the order is set; [0102]: transmitting the product order to one of the retailers indicates that the *retailer is the one who receives the product order*)
- determining the existence of an actor entity within the geographic area ([0007], [0008]: identifying the retailers in the geographic location having available product for the order shows determining of the existence of the retailers in said geographic area)
- receiving the legal document from the hub system ([0102]: transmitting the product order to one of the retailers from the seller central server shows receiving the product order from the hub system)

Rothman does not explicitly disclose selecting a legal document. Instead, Rothman discloses the user *has to specify* an online purchase order or an offline purchase order of the product ([0039]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rothman to incorporate selecting a legal document since specifying either an online purchase order or offline purchase order of the product suggests that a user select a specific purchase order, which is considered equivalent to selecting a legal document, for making the purchase order of a product.

In addition, the seller central server, which is equivalent to a hub system, provides information for a user to prepare a purchase order when a user accesses the seller website (figure 9). There, the user has to select an online purchase order or an offline purchase order. The seller central server, therefore, includes a system equivalent to a document preparation system with selecting function and preparing function as claimed. Also, since the seller central server has the capability of setting a geographic area within which an actor entity will receive the legal document and the capability of determining the existence of an actor entity, the seller central server further includes a subsystem equivalent to a geographic area subsystem. Finally, the retailer system that receives the purchase order from the seller central server is the actor entity system located within the geographic area.

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, Rothman discloses that the hub system includes an input/output for communicating data to and from the actor entity system, and to and from the drafting entity system ([0055], [0056]: input/output devices for communicating from the seller central server to the user terminal where a purchase is prepared, and for communicating from the seller central server to the local distributor, which is a retailer, where the retailer is equivalent to an actor entity).

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, Rothman discloses the hub system includes an actor entity rule subsystem that checks the legal document based on rules of the actor entity system to receive the legal document ([0007], [0009], [0010]:

Art Unit: 2178

the seller server identifies one or more retailers in the geographic location having an available product, where in said geographic location, the retailer receiving the order is responsible for a product sale; [0042]-[0043]: local retailers may register with the website in order to sell the product offered by the seller at one or more geographic locations; the fact that the seller server identifies a retailer, who will receive the order, in a geographic location, based on the retailer registration's information shows that the seller server in Rothman checks on the registration's information of a retailer, which is considered as rules, for the seller server to transmit the purchase order to the retailer, if there is no retailer's registration, the retailer in the geographic area can not receive the purchase order).

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 21, Rothman discloses that that the hub system includes a search engine subsystem for accessing a service system outside the hub system ([0089], [0090], figures 14 and 15: the fact that Rothman displays the search results when the user accesses the web site of the seller server shows that the seller server, which is the hub system, includes the search engine system for performing the search function).

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Rothman does not explicitly disclose that the at least one service system is chosen from the group comprising: a bankruptcy database service, a government employee database service, a real property

database service, a skip search database service, and a law enforcement official database service.

Instead, Rothman discloses that the product order will be transmitted to the payment server such as the online credit card clearinghouses to accomplish a payment for the sale ([0039]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Rothman to incorporate the bankruptcy database service since accomplishing the payment for sale at the online credit card clearinghouses suggests using the bankruptcy database service at the clearinghouse for checking the credit card of a user for the affordability for paying the purchase order.

9. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cupps et al. (US Pat No. 5,991,739, 11/23/99, filed 11/24/97).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not disclose that setting the geographic area based on at least one of a range of longitude and a range of latitude.

Cupps discloses that a geographic area is specified by a geocode that represents a grid defined by longitude and latitude coordinates (col 6, lines 19-56, col 2, lines 51-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cupps into Rothman since Cupps teaches the geocode for

representing a grid defined by longitude and latitude coordinates thus motivating to incorporate into Rothman for further specifying a geographic area based on at least a range of longitude and a range of latitude instead of merely based on the address of the location.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Rothman does not disclose that the at least on of a range of longitude and a range of latitude are set about a location.

Cupps discloses the at least on of a range of longitude and a range of latitude are set about a location (col 6, lines 19-56: “.. the geocodes can be used to specify a *geographic location anywhere within the globe ...*”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cupps into Rothman for expanding the business all over the world via the online ordering system using geocodes for easily detecting a location in the world instead of limited identifying a location via a given address.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Rothman does not disclose the location is an address.

Cupps discloses the location is an address (col 6, lines 45-56: converting the address of each customer or vendor into its respective latitude and longitude coordinates).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cupps into Rothman since Cupps discloses that the location for setting a range of latitude or longitude is an address thus motivating to

incorporate into Rothman for setting a range of latitude or longitude of a location based on a specific address.

10. Claims 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothman as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Horowitz (US Pat No. 6,643,797 B1, 11/4/03, filed 12/14/99).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not disclose that the hub system includes a duplication subsystem that determines whether the legal document is a duplicate.

Horowitz discloses determining whether a purchase order is a duplicate (col 1, lines 10-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Horowitz into Rothman since Horowitz provides the ability of checking the duplication of the purchase order thus motivating to include into Rothman for effectively detecting errors due to duplicate data of the purchase orders in the seller system as well as eliminating the processes of the two copies of the same purchase order.

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, Rothman does not disclose that the hub system includes a duplication subsystem that determines whether the legal document is a duplicate.

Horowitz discloses determines whether a purchase order is a duplicate (col 1, lines 10-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Horowitz into Rothman since Horowitz provides the ability of checking the duplication of the purchase order thus motivating to include into Rothman for effectively detecting errors due to duplicate data of the purchase orders in the seller system.

11. Claims 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothman as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Elgamal (US Pat No. 5,671,279, 9/23/97).

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Rothman does not disclose that the hub system includes an expiration system for monitoring expiration of the legal document.

Elgamal discloses monitoring the expiration of the offer of the purchase order (col 9, lines 34-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Elgamal into Rothman since Elgamal discloses monitoring the expiration of the offer of the purchase order where the expiration of the offer of the purchase order is also the expiration of the purchase order thus motivating to incorporate into Rothman for eliminating the cases where the purchase orders are expired to clear unwanted data in the database of the seller center.

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent on claim 22, Rothman does not disclose that the hub system includes an expiration system for monitoring expiration of the legal document.

Elgamal discloses monitoring the expiration of the offer of the purchase order (col 9, lines 34-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Elgamal into Rothman since Elgamal discloses monitoring the expiration of the offer of the purchase order where the expiration is applied for the offer as well as for the purchase order thus motivating to incorporate into Rothman for eliminating the cases where the purchase orders are expired to clear unwanted data in the database of the seller center.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bennett et al. (US Pat No. 6,603,487 B1, 8/5/03, filed 10/31/96).

Hager et al. (US Pat No. 5,377,355, 12/27/94).

Driscoll, III et al. (US Pat No. 6,044,405, 3/28/00, filed 4/12/96).

Sanne (US Pat No. 6,295,536 B1, 9/25/01, filed 12/23/98).

Berlin et al. (US Pat No. 6,460,069 B1, 10/1/02, filed 3/15/99).

Bennett et al. (US Pat No. 5,940,800, 8/17/99, filed 8/31/98).

Rutledge et al. (US Pat No. 6,650,998 B1, 11/18/03, filed 7/28/97).

Clapp (US Pat No. 5,893,914, 4/13/99, filed 3/17/97).

Jecha et al. (US Pat No. 6,631,375 B2, 10/7/03, filed 12/2/98).

Anecki et al. (US 2001/0034739 A1, 10/25/01, filed 3/7/01, priority 3/7/00).

DePaolo et al. (US 2002/0065831 A1, 5/30/02, filed 6/29/01, priority 6/29/00).

Heston (US 2002/00197411 A1, 2/14/02, filed 6/6/01, priority 7/7/01).

Cauchon et al. (US 2002/0095378 A1, 7/18/02, filed 10/31/01, priority 10/31/00).

Neville (Re. 36,111, 2/23/99, filed 3/28/96).

English (US Pat No. 5,870,674, 2/9/99, filed 3/27/96).

Dennison et al. (US Pat No. 5,546,445, 8/13/96).

Dinkins et al. (US Pat No. 5,854,793, 12/29/98).

Shirley et al. (US Pat No. 5,692,206, 11/25/97).

Wills (US Pat No. 5,893,093, 4/6/99, filed 7/2/97).

Houri et al. (US Pat No. 6,665,715 B1, 12/16/03, filed 4/3/00).

Norin et al. (US Pat No. 5,794,253, 8/11/98, filed 7/12/96).

Gomes et al. (US Pat No. 6,615,209 B1, 9/2/03, filed 10/6/00, priority 2/22/00).

Ghosh-Roy et al., On-Line Legal Aid: Markov Chain Model for Efficient Retrieval of
Legal Documents, IEEE 1995, pages 1-15.

Mital et al., A Neural Network Integrated with Hypertext for Legal Document Assembly,
IEEE 1992, pages 533-539.


Jannink et al., Efficient and Flexisble Location Management Techniques for Wireless
Communication Systems, ACM 1997, pages 361-374.

Dolin et al., Pharos : A Scalable Distributed Architecture for Locating Heterogeneous Information Sources, ACM 1997, pages 348-355.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
5/25/04